

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.msylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/195,105	11/18/1998	PAUL A. FRANCISCO	146.0003-00000	3966	
22882 MARTIN & F	7590 11/18/2010 ERRARO LLP	EXAMINER			
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O'PINES STREET, NE			ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K		
HARTVILLE	OH 44632		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3628		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/18/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/195,105	FRANCISCO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	3628	

	AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	3628					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cliperiods: 	he same day as filing a Notice of Applies: (1) an amendment, affidavinal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by Did The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lat Examiner Note: (16 oct.) is checked, check either box (a) PMEP 7'06 7'07 MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7'06 7'07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 3' OF FR. 135(a). The Otation	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth er than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1:	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI 36(a) and the appropriat	in. _ED WITHIN TWO e extension fee				
have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the st set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later t may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ortened statutory period for reply origi han three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Offic e of the final rejection, e	e action; or (2) as ven if timely filed,				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b They raise new issues that would require further con but They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT /);	ΓE below);					
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a α 			ne issues for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (F 5. Applicant's relpty has overcome the following rejection(s): Owly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendmen							
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provi	will not be entered, or b) 🛛 will	•	_				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-14 and 16-33.							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14 and 10-33. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement(s)</i> . (f 13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Akiba K Robinson-Boyo Primary Examiner, Art U						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that prior art falls to teach that use tax is based on the location of the consumer. However, examiner disagrees. As disclosed in the rejection, Co. 1, lines 1-36 of Chong showsthe generation of a tax report where once the report parameters are set (e.g., date range), the sales records are sorted by location codes for each of the states in which the company is

required to report sales tax collections. In this case, used tax being based on the location of the consumer is suggested since in order for sales tax collections to be reported, the sales records are first sorted by location. Applicant also further arguest hat prior art does not teach the transmission of tax data directly to the government taxing authority. However, examiner disagrees. Cretzler teaches that the total amount of the transmission of tax data directly to the governmental taxing authority. In addition, applicant argues that prior art does not teach eaches the transmission of tax data directly to the governmental taxing authority. In addition, applicant argues that prior art does not teach a purchase being made over the Internet. However, Bloomberg suggests this feature since Bloomberg teaches that the transaction information may be stored on-line as the information is enteried by the clerk making the sales. Since this transaction information is prior and the sales process, and a purchase less part of a transaction in Bloomberg, it is therefore suggested that part of the purchase process is being done on-line.